The Cost of American Imperialism, Pps. 2-3

Even Saigon's Rigged Assembly Shows A Covert Sympathy For The Moratorium

Another Deputy, Phan Xuan Huy, said he believed the main reason for the demonstrations in the U.S. was the unwillingness of young people to fight, and said many South Vietnamese and North Vietnamese were equally disenchanted with the war.

—Reuters from Saigon Oct 23 on the debate in South Vietnam's National Assembly on an "anti-Moratorium" resolution. Significantly only 98 of the 137 legislators showed up and 40 of those present abstained on the vote. Only 58 or less than half the total membership voted for this measure which was framed by the hawks. It seems to have turned into a covert peace demonstration instead.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Now Published Bi-Weekly

VOL. XVII, NO. 20 NOVEMBER 3, 1969 WASHINGTON, D. C. 20 CENTS

He Couldn't Care Less

The best argument for marching on Washington again—and again—is that nothing really is going on here. Unless the peace movement keeps the heat on, the Vietnamese war will drag on endlessly. It is impossible—I am convinced from public observation and private soundings—to exaggerate the banality and shallowness of this Administration, its rigidity and lack of political savvy. There were, for example, half a dozen ways in which, by some kind and human gesture, the White House might have disarmed and, in the phrase fashionable among the young, "co-opted" the Oct. 15 Moratorium. To march with the thousands in the candle-light procession that night was a religious experience. There was little rancor. The Agnew attack served only to reveal how completely the White House misconceived the real tenor and mood of that demonstration. Imagine the reaction of that good-humored and solemn throng if a candle had been lit to greet them from the balcony of the White House, and Nixon had issued a statement saying, "Welcome to Washington. I, too, though in my own way, pray and seek for peace".

Chance For A Little Charisma

A more recent opportunity to disarm the opposition came with the news that the strategic arms limitation talks (SALT) were finally to begin on Nov. 17. Ambassador Dobrynin, unbeknownst to the press, brought the news of Soviet agreement to the President on Monday, Oct 20. Nixon could have turned the announcement into a grandstand play. Without the arms race and the Vietnam war, there would be no growing inflationary crisis. Flanked by Secretaries Rogers and Laird, Nixon could have acquired a little charisma by presenting himself as a man concerned with lightening the burden of the arms race. He could have taken credit for finally getting talks started. Instead the news was not broken officially until Oct. 25, a Saturday, the poorest day of the week for a major pronouncement. It was made not by the President but by Ron Ziegler, and when reporters gathered at the White House that morning all they got was one frigid sentence—

Confirming the agreement reached earlier to enter into negotiation to curb the strategic arms race, the Governments of the United States and USSR have agreed that specially designated representatives of the U.S. and the Soviet Union will meet in Helsinki on November 17, 1969, for preliminary discussion of the questions involved.

Forgotten Words Dept.

But Now We're Masochists and Snobs

"When we debate American commitments abroad . . . if we expect a decent hearing from those who now take to the streets in protest, we must recognize that neither the Department of State nor of Defense has a monopoly on all wisdom. We should bring dissenters into our policy discussions, not freeze them out . . ."

—None other than Richard M. Nixon in a pre-election radio broadcast, Sept. 19, 1968.

In this cold turkey treatment of the announcement, the White House showed itself considerably to the right of its principal Southern (and military) mentor, Strom Thurmond, a Major General in the Army Reserves and a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee. Thurmond was less insensitive than Nixon. The Senator told the AP (*Washington Star*, Oct. 26) he was hopeful "the talks will result in a significant reduction of arms and thereby increase the opportunity for peace in the world". The word "reduction" Thurmond used was too radical for the Nixon Administration. Ziegler had referred all questions to a special press conference Rogers held at the State Department after the White House briefing. The Secretary was obviously under strict instructions to be as low-keyed and astringent as possible. He told the press to "keep in mind" that the word used in the White House announcement was "curbing" the strategic arms race. To curb, according to *Webster's*, is "to keep in check, to restrain," not to reduce.

At only one point, toward the end of the conference, did the Secretary of State let himself go and risk a little eloquent pleading. He said defensively—

We are not talking about detente, or anything else. We are talking about whether it makes sense for the two of us (US and USSR) to continue to spend immense amounts of money for the next 5, 10 or 15 years on strategic weapons and end up at the end of that time in the same relative position—or whether it would be wiser to use the money for some other purposes.

We hope this will not lead Agnew to regard Rogers as effete, or Attorney General Mitchell to see him as a security

(Continued On Page Four)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Policing The "Free World" Now Costs Us Some $50 Billion A Year . . .

We support the Moratorium and we support the Mobilization. One is moderate, the other radical. Both are needed. The task of door-to-door persuasion at the grass roots is essential. In struggling for peace, we confront some of man's oldest conditioned reflexes. To eradicate them is not easy. To educate the country on the Vietnam war and its origins is still a task half-completed. Only persuasion can do the job, and in seeking to persuade we practice the deepest virtues implicit in the First Amendment. Screaming is no substitute. Rock-throwing is not a form of revolutionary activity; it is only another form of childish tantrum. The Mobilization, and the March of Death, a form of Morality Play, with a whole nation as its audience, should prove the most impressive peaceful demonstration Washington has ever seen. The country has grown sick of violence, and of Vietnam as a form of violence. It will be alienated if the frustrated and foolish in our own ranks (and the secret police provocateurs) are allowed to become violent, too, and act out in the streets what we deplore in Vietnam.

Imperialism is an impolitic word. It is only other countries which are imperialist. One's own is always engaged in some noble crusade. German Imperialism under the Kaiser was spreading *Kultur*. The Czars claimed to be extending the mystic sway of Moscow as the *Third Rome*, and their Communist successors carry on in the same vein, albeit secularized. France had a *mission civilatrice*, and Britain "the white man's burden". Bolivar long ago said that the United States "plagued" Latin America "in the name of liberty". What has happened overseas since World War II is only an extension of what has long been occurring under the Monroe Doctrine. The Greek dictatorship our Sixth Fleet supports is a Guatemala extended to the Eastern Mediterranean, and the oligarchy we bolster in Saigon in the name of freedom is no different from half a dozen similar regimes under our wing in Latin America.

1.2 Million Men Overseas

This is imperialism and it is expensive. A new survey by *Congressional Quarterly* of U.S. commitments abroad adds up the stupendous figures. In September of this year we had 1.2 million military personnel stationed abroad (out of total U.S. armed forces of 3.46 million) in more than 33 countries and foreign possessions. With them were 26,000 U.S. civilians, 350,000 dependents and 255,000 foreign nationals attached to U.S. overseas bases. There are U.S. military missions in 50 countries and we maintain 2,270 military installations overseas (not including Vietnam), of which the Pentagon designated 340 as major installations. The cost is difficult to arrive at. The Pentagon figures the cost of all U.S. military commitments overseas exclusive of Southeast Asia at $15.1 billion per year. It puts the cost of the Vietnam war at $28 billion, or a total of $43 billion, somewhat more than half the U.S. military budget. Congressional estimates run higher. Senator John Sherman Cooper in a report to the NATO parliamentarians last November estimated our NATO commitments alone at $12 to $15 billion annually and the Vietnam war at $30 to $35 billion. That would put total costs in the $50 billion range.

That $50 billion a year spent at home could in 10 years wipe out poverty, illiteracy, pollution, racial tension and much of the crime that afflicts us. A $500 billion 10-year program may sound like a lot but the Pentagon will spend a good deal more than that in the next 10 years.

These imperial commitments and their cost are now being investigated by a special subcommittee of Senate Foreign Relations under Senator Symington of Missouri. It will cover not only the cost of military commitments but of the aid programs, which have also been a part of our imperial expansion since World War II. U.S. economic and military aid from July 1, 1945, to July 1, 1968 totalled $135.5 billion. Much of the money went to reconstruct war-torn areas in Western Europe and Asia, and some of it has been put to good use in development elsewhere.

But entirely too much has gone into military forces and hardware, sparking little arms races around the world. There have been few armed conflicts since the war in which both sides did not fight with weapons the U.S. supplied. Of the total in aid since World War II, $38.8 billion is listed as military—and all but $2.8 billion of that in grants not loans. But, *Congressional Quarterly* points out, aid labelled economic

As, For Example, In Greece?

"Great patriots of past generations would find it difficult to believe that Americans would ever doubt the validity of America's resolve to protect free men from . . . attack by governments that depend upon force to control their people—governments which came into being through force alone and continue to exist by force alone . . ."

—Vice President Agnew attacking the Moratorium at a $100-a-plate GOP dinner in New Orleans Oct. 19.

Fresh Light On Our Booming Arms Sales to the Greek Dictators and South Africa

Mr. Speaker, I think my colleagues will be interested in several sets of unclassified arms sales figures I just received from the Department of Defense.

We now sell arms as a short-rank expedient to solve our balance of payments problem, to keep the munitions industry booming, and to appease temporarily the demands of other nations. Yet this arms sales program has also brought down friendly governments, bankrupted treasuries and encouraged the outbreak of wars.

Several points are apparent. First, it is with some surprise that I see we are still selling arms to South Africa—in direct contravention of our own arms embargo imposed in 1963. A State Department spokesman told me that this ban is still rigidly enforced. Apparently the State Department has not been told.

Second, it is also of interest to see that our government still sells arms to the United Arab Republic. I can only surmise that this equipment is being used against the Israelis whom we also supply with arms.

Third, our arms aid to the Greek dictatorship in fiscal year 1969 is almost 40 percent more than we sold in the previous 6 years. This equipment will no doubt be used to stamp out whatever voices of freedom remain at large.

Finally it is fascinating to note the countries—namely Greece, Iran, Republic of China, Thailand, El Salvador, Chile and Morocco—where our level of aid in fiscal year 1969 has skyrocketed compared to the average of the previous 6-year period. Are we doing the same thing to Morocco, for example, that we did in Libya—deluging them with arms that will eventually be used against our own interests?

—Coughlin (R. Pa) Congressional Record E8502 Oct. 15.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

. . . What We Could Do At Home With A 10-Year $500 Billion Program

has sometimes been primarily for military purposes: "During the 1950s, for example, 'economic' aid to Laos paid for the entire military budget in that country." A total of 78 countries have received U.S. military assistance since 1950. As part of this military aid program "some 10,000 foreign military personnel are trained annually by the U.S. at 175 centers in this country and at other locations overseas." The training includes "counter-insurgency," i.e. repressing social discontent by force.

Strange "Frontiers of Freedom"

Our own rival in imperialism is the Soviet Union, but it is a distant second in the power struggle. While we have 1.2 million men in more than 33 countries, it has 320,000 troops stationed outside its borders in four East European countries. The Brehznev doctrine is modelled on the Monroe Doctrine, and the Caracas corollary. This has made the Russians more unpopular than any other people in Eastern Europe, as we are unpopular in "our" part of the world. Just as Russia stifles liberalism in the Soviet bloc, we tend to stifle it in many of the countries under our control. Czechoslovakia and Greece are sisters in suffering. The military on both sides prefer hard-line regimes. Truman in March, 1947, pledged the U.S. to "support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressure." In Greece, where the Truman Doctrine started, as in Vietnam, we now find ourselves supporting armed minorities in subjugating the majority, non-Communist and Communist alike. The "Frontiers of Freedom" around the Eurasian rim from Greece through Iran to Taiwan are manned by dictators. Each of these countries is a potential Vietnam.

Vietnam may end, but the effort to police the world goes on. Hardly a day passes without some story from the Pentagon about budgetary cuts but the details remain suspiciously vague. *Aviation Week* for Oct. 27 says Nixon has approved spending levels over the next five-year planning period at the Pentagon of $70 to $75 billion a year. If the new level for the next five years assumes an end of the Vietnam war, then it means a rise of 40% to 50% from the level of fiscal '65 just before Johnson sent in combat troops and Americanized the war.

Progress of Self-Determination in Saigon

President Thieu's moribund 6-party "ruling alliance", touted last spring as a move to "broaden" South Vietnam's government, lost one of its major members today. Trinh Quoc Khanh, leader of the Social Democratic party, led his splinter faction of the Hoa Hao religious sect out of the alliance, asserting that the President's coalition currently "cannot do any good for the country." . . . The political alliance that the Hoa Hao left today never attracted more than six right-wing splinter groups, and Mr. Thieu never displayed any willingness to share power even with the leaders of these groups . . . The inability of the alliance to hold one of its few important members . . . can only add to the Saigon regime's almost total reliance on the military.

—Woodruff from Saigon in Baltimore Sun *Oct. 25.*

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965, the total budget outlay "by function" for the military was $49.5 billion. A post-Vietnam level of $70 to $75 billion would mean a stepup of from $20 to $25 billion.

These figures show it is not enough just to get out of Vietnam, or even as Mansfield told the Senate Oct. 20 to get out of Southeast Asia "lock, stock and barrel"—after neutralizing it with an international agreement in which the Soviets and Communist China would be asked to join. Without a major shift away from the idea of a Pax Americana, there will be scant resources left for reconstruction at home. It is imperialism and militarism which must be recognized as our enemies. The Pentagon is fighting a rear guard action on bases and personnel, as it is on Vietnam, making no more concessions than necessary to appease public opinion. Richard J. Barnet in his admirable new book *The Economy of Death* (Atheneum: $2.95) concludes that the militarization of America is now our No. 1 national security problem and warns that after Vietnam "there are waiting in the Pentagon wings 13 major new weapons systems which will move inexorably toward production and deployment unless the juggernaut is stopped." That is why we have to talk of militarism and imperialism and not just of Vietnam.

Nixon's Cry of "Character Assassination" A Way to Smear Haynsworth's Critics

"The President charges opponents of the Haynsworth nomination with 'vicious character assassination.' Personally and on behalf of the AFL-CIO, I resent this charge. The AFL-CIO privately conveyed to the President—before the nomination—as much as we then knew about the Judge's involvement in Carolina Vend-A-Matic. The President ignored our plea. The President has attacked 'piecemeal disclosure' of Judge Haynsworth's financial interests. The blame for this lies with the Judge and the Justice Department.

On June 2, before the Senate subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, the Judge declared: 'Of course, when I went on the bench I resigned from all such business associations, directorships and things of that sort.' The Senate hearings have shown this was not true. Judge Haynsworth finally admitted that he was not only a director of Vend-A-Matic but a vice-president until 1963. As the record demonstrates, approximately half of his wealth was involved in Vend-A-Matic. He owned 15 percent of the company which became a valuable investment only after he went on the bench.

"Neither the Textile Workers Union of America nor apparently the other members of the court were aware of the Judge's substantial involvement with Vend-A-Matic. While on the bench he continued to serve as a vice-president, attended weekly luncheon meetings of the directors and received directors' fees. He was a trustee of Vend-A-Matic's pension and profit sharing plan and shared responsibility for the plan's failure to comply with the law by filing annual reports with the Labor Department. His wife was a Vend-A-Matic officer for two years while he was on the bench including the time when the Darlington decision was handed down.

In 1957, when he went on the bench, Vend-A-Matic gross sales were $453,110. In 1963 when he resigned as a Vend-A-Matic official, gross sales were $3,160,665. For an original investment of approximately $3,000 in 1950, Judge Haynsworth received $437,500 in 1964. It must be remembered that Vend-A-Matic was dependent upon the textile industry. Darlington was a key case in the industry's battle against unionization of its workers. Judge Haynsworth volunteered none of these connections until questioned by members of the Judiciary Committee. Why did he and the Justice Department conceal the size of his financial involvement in Carolina Vend-A-Matic?"

—Statement by George Meany (abridged) Oct. 22.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

After Ten Months Still No Nixon Negotiating Position?

(Continued From Page One)

risk. Had this been said by the President at a White House conference, it would have reverberated in the headlines. One can only conclude that these are headlines Nixon did not want, that he is going into the talks half-heartedly.

Even Undecided On MIRV

Apparently after ten months of preparation, the Administration hasn't even decided just what it will propose in these talks. The *Washington Star* (Oct. 26) quoted unnamed officials as saying that they "expected the National Security Council to meet soon and decide exactly what should be proposed in Helsinki." This would explain why Rogers was so vague and cautious. He declined even to say what was meant by "strategic arms." He evaded a question as to whether there was "any thought on our part of proposing some sort of limitation on anti-ballistic missiles." When asked whether the U.S. might begin by proposing a mutual freeze on MIRV testing," he termed that "a complex subject" and added, "now that the talks are scheduled to start on the 17th, why we will consider how we will approach that subject." He indicated the main lines of the U.S. approach when he said we hoped (1) "to negotiate an arms limitation agreement which will keep us in the same relative position," i.e. securely ahead and (2) to be sure the agreement could be "verified, because if it can't and one side can cheat, then it certainly is not a viable agreement."

"Verification" has long been the main ploy for dragging out arms talks interminably. The negotiations for an underground test ban, now in their ninth year in Geneva with no end in sight, are an example. We spend billions on "verification" via seeing-eye satellites, flying hearing devices, and a wide variety of exotic sensors, smellers and sniffers. All the Pentagon asks in this imperfect world is the *absolute* foolproof. If marriages were concluded only after the kind of guarantees against cheating required by our arms negotiators, the population explosion would soon be ended by universal celibacy.

Perhaps one reason the Nixon Administration is so unenthusiastic about these talks is that Nixon thought, as Dulles did years ago, that the pressure of the arms race could be used to exact political concessions from the Russians. This may have been part of that still secret "plan" he announced during his election campaign last year to end the Vietnamese war. At his first press conference as President he said he wanted to have "strategic arms talks in a way and at a time that will promote, if possible, progress on outstanding political problems." But when Rogers was asked whether the initiation of the arms talk would "affect the pattern of East-West relations" he broke in to say, "They are not conditional in any sense of the word. We haven't laid down any conditions for these talks."

Oh

"Administration officials have emphasized that the President did not mean that he would take no notice of the protests but rather that he had a detailed plan for settling the war in Vietnam and could not alter the plan because of demonstrations."

—New York Times *from Washington, Oct. 20.*

Why, then, is the Nixon Administration entering the talks at all? One reason is that ratification of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Pact is lagging badly. The non-nuclear powers are waiting to see whether the nuclear superpowers are going to take seriously their obligations under Article VI. This obligates them to negotiate "cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament, and on a treaty on general and complete disarmament." Rogers said we had an obligation "under NPT treaty" to negotiate. He did not add that it was an obligation to do more than merely "curb" the nuclear arms race. Most Americans have forgotten—and both Washington and Moscow probably prefer to forget—that eight years ago in a joint declaration to the United Nations, Kennedy and Khrushchev pledged themselves on the basis of the McCloy-Zorin agreement to general and complete disarmament, with the elimination "of all stockpiles of nuclear, chemical, bacteriological and other weapons of mass destruction" and "all means of delivering" them so that war could no longer be "an instrument for settling international problems." That was eight years and several hundred billion dollars ago. We've certainly made rapid progress—backwards. *Oct. 26*

We Urge New York Readers to Vote For Lindsay

FOR STONE'S NEW BOOK

For the enclosed $6.95 send I. F. Stone's new book, In A Time of Torment (Random House) regular price $7.95

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zip..... State.....

Indicate if gift announcement wished ☐

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zip..... State.....

I. F. Stone's Weekly 11/3/69

4420 29th St. N. W., Washington, D. C. 20008

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Now Published Bi-Weekly

4420 29th St., N. W.

Washington, D. C. 20008

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. 2d Class Postage Paid at Washington, D.C. Published every other Monday except in August at 4420 29th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. An independent bi-weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $17 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED